

LEVEL #1

75-018



UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

WEST POINT · NEW YORK

PERFORMANCE
OF USMAPS GRADUATES
AT USMAPS, USMA,
AND

DDC AS ARMY OFFICERS

RECEIVED
DEC 10 1979
RECEIVED

A

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

OFFICE OF THE
DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

JUNE 1975

DUTY-HONOR-COUNTRY 79 20

3 210

AD A 077792

DDC FILE COPY



6
14
PERFORMANCE OF USNAPS GRADUATES AT USNAPS, USMA,
AND AS ARMY OFFICERS

Report No. 8D1.01-75-018

Project No. 124

Prepared by: Dr. Richard P. Butler

June 1975

12 24
10
ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were to identify the effect of USNAPS attendance on College Board scores and to determine how well USNAPS graduates perform at the U.S. Military Academy and as Army officers. Data were obtained on members of USNAPS classes as far back as the late 1940's and as current as the USMA Class of 1975. Results indicated the following: (1) USNAPS attendance improved College Board scores; (2) at USMA, Prepsters did less well in academics but at least as well or better than non-Prepsters in leadership ratings; (3) Prepsters had a higher attrition rate than non-Prepsters at USMA; (4) The Adjutant General's input had a higher "success rate" than the Active Army's; and (5) as Army officers, Prepsters and non-Prepsters performed equally on three performance indices; but on a fourth, retention on active duty, Prepsters had a higher rate.

NOTE: Any conclusions in this report are not to be construed as official U. S. Military Academy or Department of the Army positions unless so designated by other authorized documents.

DISTRIBUTION This document is prepared for official purposes only; its contents may not be reproduced or distributed (in whole or in part) without specific permission of the Superintendent, U.S. Military Academy, in each instance.

OFFICE OF THE
DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY
WEST POINT, NEW YORK 10996

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release,
Distribution Unlimited

1-2

NTIS GRA&I	
DDC TAB	
Unannounced	
Justification	
By	
Dist. Category	
Avail and/or special	

406 247 A

Introduction

The U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School (USMAPS) is a U.S. Army school which assists selected members of the Armed Forces to prepare and qualify, academically, physically, and militarily for entrance into the U.S. Military Academy (USMA). Individuals who complete the ten-month course of instruction at USMAPS automatically receive a nomination to the Military Academy. They then compete with non-USMAPS nominees for appointments to USMA.

In more specific terms, the mission¹ of USMAPS is threefold:

1. To provide instruction and training to assist individuals to qualify in academics and physical aptitude for entrance into USMA.
2. To provide instruction and training which will assist individuals in the areas of academics, military aptitude, and physical aptitude after their entrance into USMA.
3. To eliminate individuals who obviously lack motivation, academic potential, or military aptitude for USMA.

Recently, the DOD Committee on Excellence in Education, the Commandant of USMAPS, the General Accounting Office, and the Director of Admissions and Registrar at USMA have verbally expressed concern over how well USMAPS is meeting the goals of its mission. This concern possibly has occurred because of the cost of training at USMAPS--estimated by the General Accounting Office to be \$20,000 per man.

In general, questions have centered on three major topics:

1. How well does USMAPS accomplish its academic mission?
2. How well do USMAPS graduates perform at USMA?
3. How well do USMAPS graduates perform as Army officers?

The purpose of the present study was to investigate some elements of the above three questions. Responsibility of the Office of the Director of Institutional Research for conducting research concerning USMAPS is contained in USMA Reg 350-18.

Method

Two approaches were used to answer the three questions raised in the Introduction. The first consisted of a literature review of past studies that have dealt with similar issues. The second was based on new data that were gathered with the purpose of updating, expanding, and making more definitive our knowledge about USMAPS. From these new data, information on the question concerning how well USMAPS accomplishes its academic mission was obtained by comparing College Entrance Examination Board scores (SAT-verbal and SAT-math) obtained prior to the beginning of training at USMAPS with those obtained at a January administration. The January administration came after the first term, which is specifically designed to prepare individuals for the College Board tests. It should be noted that improvement in mathematics and English is the main academic goal of USMAPS. It directly follows that if USMAPS is meeting this goal, then improvement in mathematics and English is the result. For this phase of the study, dropouts and graduates of the USMAPS Class of 1971 were used. In addition to examining changes in mean scores for the total class, a separate analysis based on the source of appointment to USMAPS was also made. This analysis was made on individuals already on active duty at the time of application, called the Active Army or AA group, and on individuals not on Active Army duty at the time of application, called The Adjutant General or TAG group. USMAPS retention data were also obtained and analyzed separately for these two groups.

¹USMAPS Catalogue, DA Pam 351-1.

To determine if the USMAPS program was beneficial to all ability level groups, quintiles based on pre-USMAPS College Board scores for the USMAPS Class of 1971 were formed, and each quintile was tested for differences in the prior and January administration of the College Boards.

Information pertaining to the performance of USMAPS graduates at USMA was obtained by comparing them with non-USMAPS graduates on four USMA performance variables. The first three comparisons were made on cumulative General Grade Point Average (GGPA), cumulative Academic Average, and current Leadership Evaluation Score (LES), while controlling for, respectively, Whole Man Score, CEER of record, and Leadership Potential Score. Academic Average and GGPA were gathered as of the Summer of 1974 and reflect three full years of performance at USMA. LES was the 2nd Class year-end leadership rating. The subjects for this phase of the study were those still enrolled from the USMA Class of '74. The AA and TAG breakouts were also used. The fourth performance variable, retention as of the Summer of 1974 was investigated while employing the same control variables as mentioned above.

Concerning performance as Army officers, USMAPS and non-USMAPS graduates from the USMA Classes of 1961, 62, 63, 64 and 65 were compared on three performance indices obtained from the Office of Personnel Operations (OPO), Department of the Army. The indices were compiled as of January 1972 and were:

1. Six Year Order of Merit List Rankings (6-Year OMLR's). These rankings were based on cumulations obtained for active duty officers up to their sixth year of service and on resignees up to departure but not exceeding their sixth year of service. The rankings were based on efficiency reports and were prepared separately by each branch. The officers were then placed in upper, middle and lower thirds within branches. All OMLR's contained USMA graduates only, and no comparisons with other sources of commissioning were made.

2. Current Order of Merit List Rankings (Current OMLR's). These rankings were based on military and civilian education, combat experience, awards and decorations, command and staff experience, and manner of performance and potential as reflected on all efficiency reports. Approximately 74% of the scoring value was placed on the command, staff, manner of performance, and potential categories. These rankings were prepared separately by branch, and the officers were placed in the upper, middle, or lower third within branches. Only active duty officers as of January 1972, and who were USMA graduates, were included.

3. Promotions. This variable was scored by assigning a value of 3 to all officers who received an early promotion, a 1 to all whose promotions had been delayed, and a 2 for all others.

Information on a fourth officer performance criterion, retention on active duty for USMAPS and non-USMAPS graduates, was obtained for members of the USMA Classes of 1951 through 1968.

Concerning the N's for the performance groups at USMAPS, USMA, and in the Army, it was not always possible to utilize the official full strength N's. This was so because multiple computer files were used to collate the data, and some individuals did not have the same identification numbers on each file. The non-matches were discarded. However, several checks with other data showed the non-matches to be randomly distributed.

Results

The findings from the literature review and those based on new data that were obtained specifically for the present study will be presented in three sections, each of which will cover one of the three questions raised in the Introduction.

1. How well does USMAPS accomplish its academic mission? Results of comparing the change in the College Board scores for the USMAPS Class of 1971 are shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3. Table 1 indicates that for USMAPS graduates, the Total group and both the TAG and AA groups all increased their SAT-V and SAT-M scores by a statistically significant

amount, indicating that the increases were not chance occurrences. If USMAPS had no effect on the College Boards, then the scores would have been as likely to decrease as to increase. For the Total, TAG and AA groups the mean increases ranged from 22 to 73 points, and the SAT-M scores increased more than the SAT-V scores.

Table 2 shows the same comparisons for individuals who were members of the USMAPS Class of 1971 but who failed to graduate. As was found for the graduates, the Total and AA groups both showed statistically significant increases in their SAT-V and SAT-M scores, with greater increase in SAT-M. However, unlike the graduates, the scores for dropouts in the TAG group did not increase significantly.

In comparing the change in College Board scores for quintiles, Table 3 shows that each quintile significantly increased its SAT-M score from the prior to January test administrations. For SAT-V the top and second quintiles did not increase their scores to a statistically significant degree, but the other three quintiles did.

Other studies dealing with changes in College Board scores have resulted in findings similar to those described above. For members of the USMAPS Class of 1968, the average increase in both the SAT-M and SAT-V scores for those who had taken both the prior and January examinations was about 50 points (Duggins, 1968). In a similar study (USMAPS Annual Report, 1973) dealing with the USMAPS Classes of 1971, 1972, and 1973, large increases were also found between the prior and January testings. For SAT-V, the increases for the Classes of 1971, 72, & 73 were, respectively, 26, 44 and 39. For SAT-M the increases were 51, 45, and 59. In an earlier study, Marron (1965) investigated the change in College Board scores for individuals enrolled at ten well-known preparatory schools, including USMAPS. He also found large differences between the pre and post training scores.

No prior studies were found that dealt with College Board changes for dropouts, nor did any divide the graduate group into quintiles that were based upon the prior SAT scores as did the present study.

2. How well do USMAPS graduates perform at USMA? Comparison of USMAPS and non-USMAPS graduates on performance at USMA is shown in Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7. Table 4 indicates that for all CEER score ranges except 200-500, USMAPS graduates performed below their non-USMAPS counterparts on cumulative Academic Average. For the 200-500 CEER score range, there was no significant difference in academic performance. Table 5 shows similar findings for cumulative General Grade Point Average. Table 6 points out that the two groups did not differ statistically on their leadership scores. Retention figures for USMAPS and non-USMAPS graduates are listed in Table 7. Overall, 53 percent of the Prep group were still enrolled, compared to 66% for the non-Prep group, which is a statistically significant difference. Individuals with CEER scores between 200-500 and WMS between 2000-5500 appear to be particularly vulnerable to leaving USMA.

Table 8 compares individuals who were TAG or AA appointees to USMAPS and later came to the Military Academy. Results of the t tests indicate that there were no significant differences in performance for the TAG and AA groups on the major USMA performance indices.

Table 9 presents retention data for the AA and TAG subgroups. Analyses of success rates showed that for each of the four classes, there were statistically significant differences between the two groups at the .001 level, with TAG's having a much higher retention or success rate.

Table 10 lists the reasons why USMAPS and non-USMAPS graduates left the Military Academy. By far the most frequently given reason for both groups was "resigned for motivational causes," with 63 percent of USMAPS losses and 76 percent of non-USMAPS losses listing this reason. The small N's for the other categories makes comparisons difficult, but there does not appear to be any outstanding differences between the two groups for each reason listed.

Several previous studies also have dealt with the performance of USMAPS graduates at the Military Academy. The findings of these studies and the present one concerning Academic

Average are similar, with non-USMAPS graduates scoring higher. For example, Morgovsky (1971) using members of the Classes of 1971-1974, Wise (1968) dealing with the Classes of 1970-71, and Howland (1968) studying the Class of 1970, all concluded that USMAPS graduates have lower academic averages than non-USMAPS graduates. Since there is some overlap in classes for these studies, it must be realized that they are not completely independent of one another. Wise also found that College Board scores overpredict academic performance of USMAPS graduates at USMA. In addition, a memorandum from Howland (1967) indicated that for the Classes of 1963-1970, USMAPS graduates stood somewhat lower (performed more poorly) in General Order of Merit. Wise (1968) also came to the same conclusion about General Grade Point Average.

Such agreement between the present and past studies was not the case when leadership ability ratings were used as the comparison variable. Morgovsky (1971), Wise (1968), and Howland (1968) all found that USMAPS graduates perform better than other cadets on end-of-Fourth Class Year ASR. Medsker and Houston (1973) investigated the combined Classes of 1965-1973 and concluded that USMAPS graduates rank higher (perform better) than non-Prep cadets in term-end First Class Year ASR Order of Merit. However, they did note that for individual classes there were mixed results, with some classes having USMAPS graduates score higher, others having them score lower, and in still others, there were no significant differences between the two groups.

Concerning retention, a past study by Wise (1968) resulted in similar findings to the present study. Investigating the Classes of 1970-71, he found that for TAG's four out of five entered USMA, while for AA's four out of five failed to enter USMA. Once at USMA, TAG's had a lower attrition rate than the AA's. A study by Medsker and Houston (1973) provides trend information about attrition of USMAPS and non-USMAPS graduates from USMA (Table 11). From their data, it is obvious that for many years USMAPS graduates have had a higher attrition rate at USMA than non-USMAPS cadets.

3. How well do USMAPS graduates perform as Army officers? Data answering this question are given in Table 12, which shows that there were no significant differences between USMAPS and non-USMAPS graduates on any of the three criteria. In fact, the groups seem to be so well matched that on 8 of the 15 comparisons USMAPS grads scored numerically but not significantly higher, and on the remaining 7, non-USMAPS grads were nonsignificantly higher.

Concerning the fourth officer performance criterion, retention on active duty, data from former studies were relied upon. Table 13 shows the resignation rates of Prep and non-Prep graduates from the USMA Classes of 1951-64 (De Luca, 1973). Except for the first two classes, Prep graduates from all other classes resigned at a lower rate. The total resignation rates, 19.8% for Prepsters and 27.7% for non-Prepsters, are statistically significant different beyond the .001 level.

A study by Levy (1973) involved separation from active duty of members of the USMA Classes of 1954-68. However, his criterion for inclusion in the sample was not limited to those commissioned in the Army. Instead, he used graduates commissioned in the Army as well as other services. Levy also considered graduates who were deceased while on active duty or retired prior to 20 years service for medical reasons to be considered on active duty through normal retirement age. Graduates who resigned or were otherwise discharged without retirement benefits were considered as separations. Results of his study are in Table 14. He found that 29.7% of the non-Prep USMA graduates were separated prior to retirement, and that 19.5% of the Prep School USMA graduates departed prior to retirement. Levy's conclusion was that Prepsters who graduate from West Point are apparently more highly motivated towards a military career and voluntarily remain on active duty longer than their non Prep School classmates.

Discussion

The purposes of this study were to investigate the change in College Board scores as a result of attendance at USMAPS, and to determine how well USMAPS graduates perform at USMA and as Army officers. Concerning the change in College Board scores, there can be little doubt that USMAPS' training and education appreciably increase scores for the typical

graduate. There is also some evidence to indicate that even those who failed to graduate from USMAPS increased their College Board scores (Table 2). This latter finding provides partial support to the belief that the increase in total class score is not because those who could not profit dropped out. However, whether or not those individuals who failed to graduate and dropped out before the January College Board testing session would have increased their scores is not known. For the most part, the increase in USMAPS graduates' scores took place across the range of ability groups that enter USMAPS (Table 3). While some regression to the mean occurred, the finding that it was not more prevalent is remarkable and speaks well for USMAPS. The USMAPS program, therefore, seems to be successful in one of its main academic goals. By so doing, it widens the candidate pool and allows many individuals who previously could not qualify for admission to the Military Academy to receive appointments. USMAPS can thus serve as an avenue of upward mobility to many types of individuals; for example, individuals with poor academic backgrounds because of poor school or home environments, or individuals who were not motivated to do well in high school but became motivated during their tenure as enlisted men.

It should be noted that several well-controlled studies to determine the effects of coaching on the SAT's indicated that average increases of less than 10 points occurred (Anastasi, 1968). The Trustees of the College Board, reviewing these studies, stated that it is not reasonable to believe that admissions decisions can be influenced by such small changes in scores (College Entrance Examination Board, 1965, pp. 8-9). The findings of the present study showed much larger average increases and indicates that USMAPS is able to accomplish something that other coaching programs do not. However, whether or not the other coaching programs were equivalent to USMAPS' is not known by the information available for the present study.

In regard to the performance of USMAPS graduates at the Military Academy, Prepsters do not perform as well as non-Prepsters in academics and, since General Grade Point Average is heavily weighted with academics, they do not perform as well in it either. This is a fairly well established but perhaps not a very important finding because of three reasons. First, the mean scores for Prepsters in academics is certainly far above failing. Second, few Prepsters are separated because of inability in academics, the majority (78%) being voluntary resignees. Third, there is not a strong relationship between academic performance at USMA and later officer performance (Baier, 1948; Butler, 1974; Gaylord & Russell, 1951; Haggerty & Stubbs, 1962; King et al., 1952). In leadership (LES), the performance index that is most closely related to officer performance (see studies cited in last sentence), the Prepsters did as well as the non-Prepsters in the present study. In past studies, Prepsters even did better (Morgovsky, 1971; Wise, 1968; Howland, 1968). It thus appears that looking at the composite of academics, General Grade Point Average, and leadership that Prepsters and non-Prepsters who remain at USMA are adequately prepared in these areas.

In spite of the above discussion, there does appear to be one performance index in which USMAPS cadets are weak; namely, attrition from USMA. This is a crucial statistic and one of the more important performance indices at USMA. Data from the last twenty years indicates that USMAPS graduates have a higher attrition rate than non-USMAPS graduates. This problem for prepsters is compounded when one looks at their "Success Rate" in Table 9. Table 9 shows that the main contributor to the low success rate has been those who entered USMAPS under the Active Army category. Whether this difficulty can be overcome by changing the quota system, better screening devices, different motivational programs, or whatever, remains to be seen.¹ One change that might quickly improve the retention rate would be to allow entrance to fewer individuals with CEER scores of 200-500 and MMS's of 2000-5500.

Concerning officer performance, Prepsters and non-Prepsters did not differ on Six Year Order of Merit List Rankings, Current Order of Merit List Rankings, or Promotions. They did differ on retention on active duty, with Prepsters having a significantly higher rate. These findings somewhat balance off those dealing with USMA performance. For example, the Prepsters' attrition rate at USMA is higher, but for officers the resignation

¹ The Office of the Director of Institutional Research is currently conducting a study to investigate how this and related problems can be overcome.

rate is lower. This raises the question as to the interaction between USMA and officer retention. It may be that action taken to reduce attrition at USMA will increase resignation in the Army. Is it worth it to have a higher officer retention rate for Prepsters than non-Prepsters if the Prepster USMA rate is lower? The answer to this is multifaceted and beyond the scope of the present study.

Conclusion

In answer to the three questions listed in the introduction, the following conclusions are made:

1. USMAPS is effective in accomplishing its academic goal of increasing its graduates' performance on verbal (SAT-V) and math (SAT-M) tests.
2. At USMA, Prepsters do less well than non-Prepsters in academics; but on the average, Prepsters perform adequately.
3. For the USMA Class of 1975, Prepsters and non-Prepsters do not differ on leadership ability (LES). For several earlier classes, Prepsters did better on leadership ratings.
4. Prepsters have a higher attrition rate than non-Prepsters at USMA.
5. TAG's have a higher success rate than AA's.
6. As officers, ^{USMAPS} ~~USMA~~ graduates perform as well as non-USMAPS graduates on Six Year Order of Merit List Rankings, Current Order of Merit List Rankings, and Promotions. However, USMAPS graduates have a higher retention rate on active duty.

REFERENCES

- Anastasi, A. Psychological Testing. New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Baier, D. E. Selection and evaluation of West Point cadets. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1948, 9, 193-199.
- Butler, R. P. Relationships between cadet and officer performance. Office of the Director of Institutional Research, U. S. Military Academy, West Point, NY, November 1974.
- College Entrance Examination Board. Effects of Coaching on Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores. New York: CEEB, 1965.
- De Luca, A. P. "Congressional request for Academy Preparatory School information." Memo to ODCSPER (LTC Henninger) from the Commandant of USMAPS, 5 September 1973.
- Duggins, F. H. "Annual report of the commandant - 1967-1968." U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School, Fort Belvoir, VA, 1968.
- Gaylord, R. H. & Russell, E. West Point evaluation measures in the prediction of officer efficiency. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1951, 11, 605-611.
- Haggerty, H. R. & Stubbs, J. R. "Prediction of field grade officer performance of West Point graduates." Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, St. Louis, September 1962.
- Howland, J. S. "Brief analyses of USMAPS graduates." Memo to the Chief of Staff (USMA) from the Director of Research, 18 July 1967.
- Howland J. S. "Brief report on USMAPS research findings." Memo to the Deputy Chief of Staff (P&A) from the Director of Research, 4 Sep 1968.
- King, S. H., Campbell, J. T., Johnson, C. D., Klieger, W. A., & Yaukey, D. W. "Studies of the performance of officers in combat: I. Relationship of West Point Measures to later combat effectiveness." Army Project Number 29535100, PRS Report 969, August 1952.
- Levy, L. R. "USMA graduate separations from active duty." A USMAPS report dated 3 December 1973.
- Marron, J. "Special test preparation, its effect on college board scores and the relationship of effected scores to subsequent college performance." Office of Research, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, NY, 1965.
- Nedsgar, G. W., & Houston J. "USMAPS grads, attrition, and ASR." Memo to the Comptroller from the Director of Institutional Research, 11 December 1973.
- Norgovsky, J. "Performance and predicted performance of USMAPS cadets at USMA: Cl '71-'74." Office of Institutional Research, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, NY, 1971.
- Wise, A. E. "Performance at USMA of USMA Preparatory School graduates - USMA Classes of 1970 and 1971." Office of Research, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, NY, 1968.
- _____. Annual Report - Academic Year 1972-73. U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School, Fort Belvoir, VA, 1973.

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF PRIOR AND JANUARY
COLLEGE BOARD SCORES OF USMAPS GRADUATES

GROUP		COLLEGE BOARD SCORES			
		PRIOR SAT-V	JANUARY SAT-V	PRIOR SAT-M	JANUARY SAT-M
TOTAL:					
	\bar{X}	494	521	547	601
	SD	85	90	71	76
	N		150		150
	r		.73		.67
	t		5.20		11.00
	P		<.0005		<.0005
TAG:					
	\bar{X}	490	512	547	596
	SD	85	85	67	76
	N		126		126
	r		.73		.63
	t		3.89		8.84
	P		<.0005		<.0005
AA:					
	\bar{X}	514	577	550	623
	SD	82	78	90	76
	N		24		24
	r		.71		.87
	t		4.93		7.78
	P		<.0005		<.0005

NOTE: The t tests were one-tailed for correlated data.

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF PRIOR AND JANUARY
COLLEGE BOARD SCORES OF USMAPS DROPOUTS

GROUP		COLLEGE BOARD SCORES			
		PRIOR SAT-V	JANUARY SAT-V	PRIOR SAT-M	JANUARY SAT-M
TOTAL:	\bar{X}	518	548	589	641
	SD	105	113	80	70
	N	35		35	
	r	.84		.61	
	t	2.82		4.52	
	p	<.005		<.0005	
TAG:	\bar{X}	567	578	598	627
	SD	105	115	86	60
	N	10		10	
	r	.77		.58	
	t	0.44		1.23	
	p	>.05		>.05	
AA:	\bar{X}	499	536	586	646
	SD	98	110	76	73
	N	25		25	
	r	.87		.65	
	t	3.32		4.71	
	p	<.005		<.0005	

NOTE: The t tests were one-tailed for correlated data.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF PRIOR AND JANUARY COLLEGE BOARD SCORES OF
USMAPS GRADUATES ORDERED BY QUINTILES BASED ON PRIOR COLLEGE BOARD SCORES

QUINTILE		COLLEGE BOARD SCORES			
		PRIOR SAT-V	JANUARY SAT-V	PRIOR SAT-M	JANUARY SAT-M
TOP FIFTH:					
	\bar{X}	603	608	637	670
	SD	66	81	46	59
	N	30		30	
	r	.82		.60	
	t	0.58		3.68	
	P	>.05		<.0005	
SECOND:					
	\bar{X}	524	536	572	618
	SD	49	55	39	49
	N	30		30	
	r	.39		.60	
	t	1.12		6.16	
	P	>.05		<.0005	
THIRD:					
	\bar{X}	482	521	547	613
	SD	41	62	42	62
	N	30		30	
	r	.55		.44	
	t	4.01		6.16	
	P	<.0005		<.0005	
FOURTH:					
	\bar{X}	459	492	514	578
	SD	37	78	41	53
	N	30		30	
	r	.52		.29	
	t	2.66		4.54	
	P	<.01		<.0005	
BOTTOM FIFTH:					
	\bar{X}	400	455	469	524
	SD	58	72	45	72
	N	30		30	
	r	.31		.05	
	t	3.84		3.57	
	P	<.0005		<.001	

NOTE: The t tests were one-tailed for correlated data.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF USMAPS GRADUATES WITH ALL OTHER
CADETS ON CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AT USNA

CEER RANGE	CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC AVERAGE	
	USMAPS	NON-USMAPS
200-500:		
\bar{X}	2.270	2.292
SD	0.036	0.072
N	7	45
t		- .778
p		> .05
501-600:		
\bar{X}	2.345	2.401
SD	0.101	0.108
N	48	409
t		- .414
p		< .001
601-800:		
\bar{X}	2.445	2.559
SD	0.104	0.120
N	21	333
t		-4.243
p		< .001
<hr/>		
200-800:		
\bar{X}	2.366	2.462
SD	0.111	0.141
N	76	787
t		-5.768
p		< .001

NOTE: The t tests were two-tailed for uncorrelated data.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF USMAPS GRADUATES WITH ALL OTHER CADETS
ON CUMULATIVE GENERAL GRADE POINT AVERAGE AT USMA

WHOLE MAN SCORE RANGE	CUMULATIVE GENERAL GRADE POINT AVERAGE		
	USMAPS	NON-USMAPS	
2000-5500:			
\bar{X}	2.360	2.372	
SD	0.108	0.104	
N	13	97	
$\frac{t}{E}$		-3.366	
		>.05	
5501-6000:			
\bar{X}	2.371	2.435	
SD	0.100	0.109	
N	49	409	
$\frac{t}{E}$		-3.910	
		<.001	
6001-8000:			
\bar{X}	2.445	2.553	
SD	0.065	0.121	
N	14	281	
$\frac{t}{E}$		-3.305	
		<.001	

2000-8000:			
\bar{X}	2.383	2.470	
SD	0.099	0.130	
N	76	787	
$\frac{t}{E}$		-5.676	
		<.001	

NOTE: The t tests were two-tailed for uncorrelated data.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF USMAPS GRADUATES WITH ALL OTHER
CADETS ON LEADERSHIP EVALUATION SCORE AT USMA

LEADERSHIP POTENTIAL SCORE RANGE	LEADERSHIP EVALUATION SCORE		
	USMAPS	NON-USMAPS	
200-550:	\bar{X}	2.544	2.498
	SD	0.160	0.150
	N	16	141
	t	1.147	
	P	>.05	
551-650:	\bar{X}	2.484	2.525
	SD	0.173	0.151
	N	41	429
	t	-1.636	
	P	>.05	
651-800:	\bar{X}	2.518	2.566
	SD	0.156	0.153
	N	19	217
	t	-1.304	
	P	>.05	

200-800:	\bar{X}	2.505	2.532
	SD	0.166	0.153
	N	76	787
	t	-1.458	
	P	>.05	

NOTE: The t tests were two-tailed for uncorrelated data.

TABLE 7
RETENTION AT USMA FOR
USMAPS AND NON-USMAPS GRADUATES
(USMA CLASS OF 1975)

ADMISSION VARIABLE	USMAPS			NON-USMAPS		
	N ENTERED	N ENROLLED	% ENROLLED	N ENTERED	N ENROLLED	% ENROLLED
<u>CEER Range</u>						
200-500	23	7	30%*	86	45	52%
501-600	91	48	53%*	631	409	65%
601-800	30	21	70%	484	333	69%
<u>WGS Range</u>						
2000-5500	33	13	39%*	171	97	57%
5501-6000	86	49	57%	631	409	65%
6001-8000	25	14	56%	399	281	70%
<u>LPS Range</u>						
200-550	31	16	52%	216	141	65%
551-650	78	41	52%**	649	429	66%
651-800	35	19	54%	336	217	64%
TOTAL:	144	76	53%***	1201	787	66%

*Using a one-tailed t test, the difference between USMAPS and Non-USMAPS %'s enrolled is statistically significant at the .05 level ($p < .05$).

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .005$

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF TAG AND AA APPOINTEES TO
USMAPS ON USMA PERFORMANCE INDICES

<u>STATISTICS</u>	<u>CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC AVERAGE</u>	
	<u>TAG</u>	<u>AA</u>
\bar{X}	2.358	2.406
SD	0.103	0.146
N	64	12
t	-1.358	
P	>.05	

	<u>CUMULATIVE GENERAL GRADE POINT AVERAGE</u>	
	<u>TAG</u>	<u>AA</u>
\bar{X}	2.375	2.424
SD	0.092	0.130
N	64	12
t	-1.553	
P	>.05	

	<u>LEADERSHIP EVALUATION SCORE</u>	
	<u>TAG</u>	<u>AA</u>
\bar{X}	2.494	2.566
SD	0.156	0.212
N	64	12
t	-1.360	
P	>.05	

NOTE: The t tests were two-tailed for uncorrelated data.

TABLE 9
RETENTION FIGURES FOR FOUR USMAPS CLASSES¹
AT THE PREP SCHOOL AND THE MILITARY ACADEMY²

GROUP	N ENTERED USMAPS	N GRADUATED FROM USMAPS	N QUALIFIED FOR USMA	N ENTERED USMA	N STILL ENROLLED AT USMA	SUCCESS RATE ²
<u>USMAPS CLASS OF 1971</u>						
AA	160	57	45	37	12	7.5%
TAG	148	134	120	112	66	44.6%
<u>USMAPS CLASS OF 1972</u>						
AA	139	66	46	39	25	18.0%
TAG	158	139	128	119	70	44.3%
<u>USMAPS CLASS OF 1973</u>						
AA	147	85	72	63	39	26.5%
TAG	183	161	144	128	89	48.6%
<u>USMAPS CLASS OF 1974</u>						
AA	172	96	81	70	62	36.0%
TAG	149	133	119	112	95	63.8%

¹ Data collected as of Spring, 1975 in a personal communication from CPT L. R. Levy of USMAPS.

² Success Rate = $\frac{\text{Number Still Enrolled at USMA}}{\text{Number Entered USMAPS}}$

TABLE 10
REASONS WHY USMAPS AND NON-USMAPS GRADUATES
ATTRITED FROM THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY¹
(USMA CLASS OF 1975)

REASONS	USMAPS GRADUATES		NON-USMAPS GRADUATES	
	N	%	N	%
RESIGNED				
Academic	4	6	6	1
Motivation	43	63	314	76
Honor	6	9	28	7
Personal	0	0	1	0
Other	0	0	4	1
SUBTOTAL - Resigned	53	78	353	85
SEPARATED - PERSONALITY				
Conduct	0	0	1	0
Traits of Character	2	3	1	0
Honor	0	0	3	1
Leadership	1	1	3	1
Leadership & Academic	0	0	3	1
SUBTOTAL - Separated - Personality	3	4	11	3
SEPARATED - INABILITY				
Academic	6	9	26	6
Physical Education	2	3	6	1
Medical	2	3	7	2
SUBTOTAL - Separated - Inability	10	15	39	9
DECREASED				
Accidental	0	0	1	0
TURNED BACK				
Academic	2	3	10	2

¹Data collected as of Fall, 1974.

TABLE 11

ATTRITION OF USMAPS AND NON-USMAPS CADETS AT USMA

USMA CLASS YR	# USMAPS ENTERING* USMA	# USMAPS GRADUATING** USMA	USMAPS GRADS % LOSS	NON-USMAPS GRADS % LOSS
51	159	116	27.0	21.3
52	146	104	28.8	22.2
53	142	89	37.3	27.7
54	130	88	32.3	18.3
55	134	75	44.0	23.3
56	197	113	42.6	22.4
57	109	57	47.7	21.3
58	103	58	43.7	20.6
59	69	35	43.5	25.1
60	84	52	38.1	26.9
61	91	41	55.0	34.8
62	92	49	46.7	37.1
63	76	46	39.5	30.8
64	91	49	46.2	27.4
65	71	49	31.0	32.2
66	73	46	37.0	27.4
67	61	34	44.3	28.0
68	48	29	39.6	28.2
69	62	34	45.2	28.8
70	96	65	32.3	25.7
71	117	63	46.2	28.9
72	121	61	49.6	31.6
73	130	68	47.7	33.0
TOTAL USMA CL 51-73	2402	1425	40.7%	26.7%

*Turnbacks counted only in entering strength of original USMA Class.

**Graduating turnbacks counted with their graduating class.

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF USMAPS AND NON-USMAPS GRADUATES
BY BRANCH ON THREE OFFICER PERFORMANCE INDICES
(Classes of 1961-65)

		PROMOTIONS		6 YR. ONLR		CURRENT ONLR	
		USMAPS	NON-USMAPS	USMAPS	NON-USMAPS	USMAPS	NON-USMAPS
ARM:	N	13	156	17	198	14	151
	\bar{X}	2.154	2.128	2.176	2.010	2.214	2.020
	SD	.387	.390	.809	.800	.893	.796
	t	0.23		0.82		0.86	
FA:	N	29	329	38	388	31	273
	\bar{X}	2.034	2.054	1.921	1.995	2.065	1.974
	SD	.188	.242	.850	.813	.929	.811
	t	-0.43		-0.53		0.58	
INF:	N	45	342	55	428	49	340
	\bar{X}	2.133	2.280	1.927	2.000	1.918	1.994
	SD	.593	.571	.836	.813	.812	.824
	t	-1.61		-0.62		-.60	
ENG:	N	19	187	20	238	16	185
	\bar{X}	2.105	2.209	2.150	1.962	2.000	1.995
	SD	.470	.434	.813	.813	.816	.804
	t	-0.98		0.99		0.02	
SIG:	N	10	101	15	140	13	90
	\bar{X}	2.200	2.029	2.067	2.050	1.846	2.067
	SD	.438	.331	.799	.825	.801	.818
	t	1.49		0.08		-0.90	

NOTE: All t's are non-significant at the .05 level. For the Promotions criteria the Class of 1965 was removed, since no one in that Class had yet received an early or delayed promotion.

TABLE 13
RESIGNATIONS FROM ACTIVE DUTY

USNA CLASS	COMMISSIONED IN ARMY		NUMBER OF RESIGNEES		PERCENTAGE OF RESIGNATION	
	PREP	NON	PREP	NON	PREP	NON
1951	89	263	26	64	29.9	26.9
1952	71	323	24	92	34.3	31.8
1953	57	320	14	113	25.9	37.8
1954	65	380	15	132	23.5	36.8
1955	50	274	10	84	20.0	32.4
1956	78	278	15	63	19.2	24.4
1957	48	358	8	106	17.4	31.1
1958	45	382	7	109	15.9	30.0
1959	32	413	7	110	22.6	28.6
1960	46	441	8	131	18.2	30.6
1961	39	433	5	117	13.2	28.4
1962	46	480	7	107	15.9	23.4
1963*	44	402	0	86	0.0	20.4
1964*	44	448	0	45	0.0	10.5
<hr/>						
Totals	754	5,195	146	1,359	146/738	1,359/4,900
Deceased	- 16	- 295				
	<u>738</u>	<u>4,900</u>			19.8%	27.7%

*Based on the US Army Register, 1 Jan 69 and Register of Graduates and Former Cadets, 1802-1969, 30 Jun 69.

NOTE: Percentages based upon number commissioned less deceased. Data in table were obtained from A.P. DeLuca's 1973 report.

TABLE 14

SEPARATIONS FROM ACTIVE DUTY

USMA CLASS	TOTAL GRADUATES	(PREPSTERS)	TOTAL SEPARATIONS	(PREPSTERS)
54	633	(88)	214	(20)
55	470	(73)	141	(16)
56	480	(113)	115	(18)
57	546	(58)	158	(12)
58	572	(57)	172	(12)
59	499	(39)	151	(7)
60	550	(51)	187	(12)
61	534	(41)	171	(8)
62	601	(49)	189	(11)
63	504	(47)	143	(6)
64	565	(50)	175	(11)
65	596	(49)	208	(13)
66	579	(46)	180	(5)
67	583	(34)	190	(10)
68	706	(29)	19	(0)
TOTALS:	8419	(824)	2413	(161)
Non-Prep	7595		2252	29.7% Separated
Prep	824		161	19.5% Separated

NOTE: Data above were obtained from L.R. Levy's 1973 study.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 8D1.01-75-018	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Performance of USMAPS Graduates at USMAPS, USMA, and as Army Officers		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
7. AUTHOR(s) Dr. Richard P. Butler		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Office of the Director of Institutional Research United States Military Academy West Point, New York 10996		9. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
10. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Same as #9 above.		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Project No. 124
11. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) United States Military Academy West Point, New York 10996		12. REPORT DATE June 1975
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 22 + 1
		14. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
15. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Reproduction of this document in whole or in part must have prior approval of the Superintendent, United States Military Academy, West Point, New York.		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Army Performance Cadets USMA CEEB USMAPS Class of 1975 Graduates		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The purposes of this study were to identify the effect of USMAPS attendance on College Board scores and to determine how well USMAPS graduates perform at the U.S. Military Academy and as Army officers. Data were obtained on members of USMAPS classes as far back as the late 1940's and as current as the USMA Class of 1975. Results indicated the following: (1) USMAPS attendance improved College Board scores; (2) at USMA, Prepsters did less well in academics but at least as well or better than non-Prepsters in leadership ratings; (3) Prepsters had a higher attrition rate than non-Prepsters at USMA; (4) The Adjutant General's input had a higher "success rate" than the Active Army's; and (5) as Army officers, Prepsters and non-Prepsters performed equally on three perform- ance indices; but on a fourth, retention on active duty, Prepsters had a higher rate.		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 173

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)